



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ing in New Testament Greek, he argues that it fits in very well with the context of the passage under consideration, and that the other meaning is inadmissible there. The reasoning is plausible, but it falls short of demonstration. All that is proved is that the word might be used here in the sense recommended, but "might be" is a very long way from "must be." There can be no doubt that the general usage of the word in the New Testament Greek is against Professor Beyschlag's theory. Of the fifty-six passages (outside of this passage) in which it occurs there is only one in which it unquestionably means "divinity," and that one (Acts 17:18) has an archaic ring about it. Besides, the possibility if not the probability of an Old Testament background is overlooked. If, as some think, Paul had in mind Deut. 32:17, as given in the LXX., he can scarcely have meant by *daimonia* anything but "demons." It is strange that Professor Beyschlag who incidentally mentions this passage never discusses its bearing on the text. The remark that Paul nowhere else describes evil spirits as *daimonia* is valid only on the assumption of the non-Pauline origin of the Pastoral Epistles. (See 1 Tim. 4:1.) W. T. S.

---

**Ernste Blicke in den Wahn der modernen Kritik des Alten Testamentes.** Von DR. ADOLF ZAHN. Neue Folge.

This loosely constructed book is too bitter to be effective. Dr. Zahn hates modern criticism and all its works. He maintains that it has not found one single fact, one single truth. It was and is nothing but a great delusion. The Protestantism which has nursed it burns the Old Testament in a great *auto-da-fé*. Smend's elaborate History of Old Testament Religion is pronounced quite unusable because the author acknowledges his great indebtedness to Wellhausen. Holzinger's introduction to the Hexateuch is "nothing but folly." And yet these "glances" are by no means devoid of penetration. Dr. Zahn makes some points and coins some smart repartees. He is right when he says that the Bible is not a book for scholars to play with, but is meant for the building up of the church; and there is sense as well as humor in the remark that the Old Testament will soon be like a tablecloth composed of a thousand many-colored patches. Still the tone of the work is miserably narrow and intolerant. An earnest but temperate and charitable protest against the fondness for speculation displayed by many critics, and the irreverence of some, would have been very timely, but Dr. Zahn's violence defeats itself. Whilst much has been written about the Old Testament in recent years which has no permanent value, it cannot be denied by impartial judges that the intelligent study of this part of Scripture has been wonderfully furthered during the last quarter of a century. W. T. S.